



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

dividual. Indeed, this same development which is revealed in this literature is also seen in the development of the individual himself. He who sees this will understand that the Bible is not something simply to be accepted; it is to be digested, spiritually possessed—to be made a part of the individual himself. Finally, Jesus is no longer an impersonal, ecclesiastical, sacramental medium of institutional salvation. He is a teacher, a revealer of one's own real individual nature. As the revelation and realization of the unity between the human and the divine he is to be understood, appreciated and individually followed. He is, as Paul says, the completion of our individual life. He who as far as possible expresses in himself this deeper unity of things will understand the teaching of Jesus that the individual is really himself only in so far as he takes up into himself this underlying unity.

J. D. STOOPS.

EASTHAMPTON, MASS.

DISCUSSION.

EMPIRICAL DATA ON IMMORTALITY.*

A Discussion of Professor Hyslop's Report on Seventeen Sitzings with Mrs Piper.

For the first time in the history of man personal immortality has become, during the past fifteen years, the subject of what may rightly be called scientific investigation with the result that the beliefs in one Personal God and in an Impersonal Absolute—the orthodox beliefs in the Religious and in the Philosophical sphere respectively,—are giving place here and there to a new polytheism.¹ The tentative conclusions, favorable to Spiritism, of several of the more prominent investigators of the Society for Psychic

*"A Further Record of Observations of Certain Trance Phenomena," by James H. Hyslop, Ph. D., Professor of Logic and Ethics in Columbia University, New York. Published as part XLI of the "Proceedings of the Society for Psychic Research."

¹See the *Conclusion* and *Postscript* of Professor William James' book, *"The Varieties of Religious Experience;"* and Meyer's "Human Personality."

Research have moreover been reinforced by speculative arguments set forth in high philosophical quarters. The spiritistic hypothesis can no more be dismissed with a shrug of the shoulder.

Professor Hyslop's book of 649 pages is the most extensive and thorough of the many reports we have had on Mrs. Piper's trance utterances.² No pains have been spared to avoid error and to ascribe to every item of evidence its proper weight. Professor Hyslop deserves gratitude for his painstaking work and admiration, rather than taunts, for the courage with which he has announced his adoption of an unpopular belief. There is truth in his opinion that "it is the hard sacrifice of human pride and vanity that stand more in the way of a scientific and respectful consideration of these phenomena than anything else" (p. 290). These seventeen sittings, together with evidences from other quarters, have led him to the conclusion that spiritism is the preferable hypothesis. We shall see presently how far the Report substantiates this claim.

It is often remarked by advocates of Spiritism that all, or nearly all, those who have been favored with a *series* of sittings with Mrs. Piper have come to the same conclusion: Mrs. Piper's utterances, they have said, point to, and come near proving, Spiritism. There is no need of being disturbed by this unanimity. It is more to the point to look upon it as due to a natural selection of the ready-to-be-convinced and to the illegitimate affective influence of the sittings. Those well disposed towards Spiritism are about the only one to enter into a protracted investigation. Once launched into the undertaking, it is practically impossible to remain unbiased, even though there had been no initial inclination. I know of no body of facts in which it is easier, for two men urged in different directions by their wishes, to reach the preferred conclusion, in spite of the most sincere efforts at impartiality. The nature of the evidence is such that at a dozen different turning points one may—nay, one *will*—incline either to the right or to the left, according to one's prepossession, just as certainly as the hand will move the planchette although the will to do it be absent.

The Report before us is a luminous instance of these unconscious influences on a person of transparent sincerity of purpose and no more gullible than the average man of his profession. The warmth of feeling which enlivens the volume shows how vitally

²See the Reports of Prof. Romaine Newbold and of Dr. Hodgson in the "Proc. of the Soc. Psy. Res."

the author is concerned with the success of his investigation. Perhaps the most striking illustration of this biasing influence is his construction of the word *tokens* (pp. 397 and 411) as "little oblong metal pieces of a coin-like character used in the Associated Presbyterian Church to indicate the person's right to participate in the Communion service," when the obvious and, as it seems to me, the only meaning allowed by the context is that of token of friendship. Professor Hyslop's gratuitous interpretation makes of this a wonderful incident. When those who have sat with Mrs. Piper say, as they are wont to do, "Yes, of course, you cannot be convinced at the reading of the reports; it is something you have to witness to realize its full import," I cannot help believing that most—perhaps all—of this added persuasiveness is due to the emotional tone in which one naturally gets during the sittings, a mood which reinforces the more or less unconscious desires and thereby deflects the judgment. Where is the man who can escape the affective influence of an atmosphere of apparent wonder? Who can make a sincere effort to enter into communication with the spirit of his father or of his mother, hear them speak to him, and remain the cold, judicious observer he ought to be? There is but one alternative, either to break the spell by escaping into the open air, or remain and fall victim to the witchery of the feelings. Therefore I say, let us rather listen to the conclusion of those who have only read and not witnessed.

The reader of the Report must be cautioned against the *totally wrong impression* given by the first half of the volume,³ *i. e.*, the general account of the facts, the commentaries upon them and the discussion of the hypotheses that might be offered in explanation of them. This is because in that part the writer of the Report goes over those incidents only which have, or might have, evidential value; the others, *i. e.*, the false and the irrelevant are passed over unmentioned. It is clear, for instance, that if the medium had thrown out the several relevant names given in the first seances without any addition of wrong or irrelevant ones, the performance would have been totally different from the actual one: the chance-hypothesis would have been eliminated. Of this Professor Hyslop is, of course, fully aware. The second part of the volume contains the full sittings. That is what ought to be read in order to form a correct judgment.

³Prof. Hyslop need not be blamed for this. It was too difficult to present the report otherwise.

The seventeen sittings were held at intervals between December 23, 1898 and June 8, 1899. Dr. Richard Hodgson was present at all of them and arranged for them. At five of them he was alone and received communications in behalf of Professor Hyslop. These two men and the latter's wife were the only persons who knew in advance that the sittings were to take place. Mrs. Piper had met Professor Hyslop twice before, in 1892. He had had at that date part of a sitting under an assumed name but he was introduced to her by his own name after the trance. At the beginning of the present series of sittings he wore a cloth mask to make recognition impossible. He was introduced as Mr. Smith, bowed without uttering a sound and did not speak a word until after she had gone into the trance. At the beginning of the second sitting, a communicator, supposedly his father, calls him repeatedly by his first name, "James, James. Speak James."

During the trance Mrs. Piper's right cheek rests on two pillows placed on the table. Her eyes are closed. She writes the messages with her right hand. The manner of the communications has fine dramatic possibilities. She is, apparently, in control of several spirits whose self-appointed business is to act as intermediaries between the sitter and the would-be communicators. The more important of these controls have been named *Imperator* and *Rector*. The latter usually acts as amanuensis. They often give advice both to the sitter and to the spirits, who, it must be said, are in sad need of it. "Don't speak so rapidly," "He does not understand you," etc. The chief communicator in the seventeen sittings is Professor Hyslop's father, Robert Hyslop, who died in 1896.

It will be taking the bull by the horns to begin with the utterances of Mrs. Piper disclosing things the sitter claims never to have known.⁴ The universal, unlimited, Telepathy which according to his interpretation of the facts, it would be necessary to admit if Spiritism were rejected, is an hypothesis bristling with the greatest difficulties and without scientific support, as he rightly urges. If, however, the narrow Telepathy, limited to intercourse between the Medium and the Sitter, was to be proven sufficient, Professor Hyslop would lose his chief reason for preferring the Spiritistic hypothesis. We shall have to proceed without attempting to answer the well-nigh unanswerable question, "What sort of things may a man be sure he never knew?"

⁴A classification of the incidents is to be found on pp. 131, 132.

A considerable proportion of the facts supposed unknown to the sitter are contained in two relatively short messages. They are instructive on many accounts and short enough to be given in full. The first is called "one of the finest set of pertinent and evidential incidents in the record." For my part, whatever its value, I do not think a better one exists in this record. The letter S means *Sitter*, i. e., Professor Hyslop.

"I am here once more. I am James McLellan, if you wish to know and you are my namesake. (S.: Yes, I remember you and that I am your namesake.) Yes, all right. We cannot quarrel about that, can we, James, but I despised the name of Jim. (S.: Very well, I understand.) What is it you want to know about Frank, or was it John who wanted to know? (S.: There was some confusion when Frank was mentioned, and also when John was mentioned. Who is this cousin John that was mentioned before?) It was not cousin, that was a mistake. (S.: Yes. Is he in the body or is he in the spirit)? He is here, and [Hand dissents violently.] I intended to straighten this out, but the light went out and I could not remain there. He is a brother yes, all right and he will be here soon. But it is still not straight. Wait and I will explain. You remember brother John very well, you must if you are James. (S.: Yes, I remember him well.) He was the one who went to war. (S.: Very well. Go on.) Let me see. Well perhaps you remember father, do you not? (S.: Do you mean *your* father?) Yes. (S.: Is this my uncle James McClellan?) Yes. (S.: No, I do not remember your father.) Well, he was John. (S.: Very well.) John James McClellan. [James written first. John written in front of James, then McClellan written after.] (R. H.: James John McClellan?) No. John James McClellan. (S.: Very well. I understand, and shall inquire about it.) Well, go ahead and inquire. I think I know. (S.: Well, all right. Please tell me anything you wish to tell.) I wanted to tell you about his going to war, and about one of his fingers being gone before he came here. (S.: Very well, go on, please. I understand.) And he had a brother David, who had a S U N stroke. (S.: I understand. That is perfectly new to me. I never heard it before, and it pleases me very much to learn this fact.) Well, he never was well after he received it until he came here. Then one more I wanted to speak of was N A N C Y, but I cannot tell you any more now. (S.: Very good. Thank you very much. Rest now.) Be brave, upright, honourable, do the best you can and don't forget your uncle James Mc. Good-bye. (S.: Good-bye, uncle, for the present.) (pp. 470-472)."

Here is what Professor Hyslop ascertained as to the truth in these statements. Uncle James McLellan had already been spoken of in a preceding seance. Professor Hyslop informs us (p. 110) that he was in fact his uncle's namesake and that the said uncle despised the word *Jim*. But his father's name was John, not John James. He had also a brother by the name of John, well

known to the sitter. He was living, ninety years old, and therefore soon to be on the "other side." Neither James McClellan's brother nor his father had been in any war. But another John McClellan was commissioned as an ensign in 1810. That John had lost a finger, probably in the War of 1812. The uncle had no brother David, but a brother-in-law David Elder, who had a slight sunstroke just after the Civil War. Nancy was the name of the sister of this David Elder and of the wife of old John McClellan.

Taken singly, any one of these statements would hardly arrest attention; grouped together, they acquire a certain impressiveness. Yet there is that in the passage which, on close examination, robs it of any serious force. Notice, for instance, the bungling, or angling, with the name John when the Communicator is informed that there has been confusion. Then there are the errors. That a certain John McClellan, other than the one mentioned and not a relative, went to war and lost a finger does not help matters much. One wonders why David is said to be a brother and not a brother-in-law and why we are not told who Nancy was. The sunstroke was slight and remembered only by one of his two living sons. It did not have the importance the communication seems to ascribe to it.

Since the chief alleged Communicator understands the purpose of the sittings and repeatedly claims to be anxious to do his best to prove his identity, why not a little more definiteness, just enough to decisively put out the chance-hypothesis? As it is, I admit that the passage is perplexing,—as much so if one accepts, as if one rejects, the Spiritistic hypothesis.

The second passage (pp. 377, 394) seems to me clearly within the possibilities of mere invention. Yet it is one of those called "remarkable." It is certainly as much so as any other, barring out the one just quoted. Any one wrongfully claiming to know a certain library and attempting to describe it might naturally enough mention a desk, pads, paper cutter, ink and mucilage bottles. So far he would stand little chance of going astray. But if he ventured into more significant particulars, errors would be expected to give him the lie. In a sitting with Dr. Hodgson alone, some one claiming to be Professor Hyslop's father mentions the sending of photographs of his library and then, with considerable hesitation, the word *Pad* is written. On being asked what a closed spectacle case contained the answers came:

"This I think is the one I used to put my Pen ho [?] No not pen, Paper cutter P sounds like in . . .

"Yes, I remember I used to have this little case on my desk a great deal. Yes. And I am sure I used to place my spectacles in it. Yes, and sometimes my paper-cutter."

The box contained at the time his spectacles as well as his pen. The latter had been in it ever since his death. Twelve days later, at another sitting of Dr. Hodgson, a metal box was pushed over the edge of the table by Mrs. Piper's hand—apparently unintentionally—revealing its contents, spectacles, pen and folded paper packet (p. 394). Thereupon the previous Communicator exclaims:

"Oh. I remember so well this pr. of spectacles, and the place in on [superposed on *in*] which it used to lie on my desk. I can see it all I also had near it a paper cutter, a writing pad, a number [of] rests . . . rests for this, and two glass bottles, yes, one square in shape and the other rather round."

As a matter of fact, Professor Hyslop's father had no library, and he never called the sitting room, which contained what books he owned, his library. Besides he never had photographs of it taken. He had a paper cutter, not for cutting the leaves of books, however, but for opening letters and he carried it in his vest pocket and, as far as living relatives knew, never in the box. They say that he did not keep his two spectacle cases on the desk and that he did not use very frequently the leather one. He used a paper pad. As to the two bottles no one excepting a brother of Professor Hyslop, Frank, remembered them. He affirmed that his father had on the desk beside his round ink bottle also a square mucilage bottle. We are not told whether or not, in the letter of inquiry Frank was told that the bottles were described one as round and the other as square. His memory may have been falsified by that information if it was given him. If the speaker had really been the owner of the desk and had been intent, as he repeatedly asserted during the sittings, upon proving his identity by a description of it, he would have taken, it seems, the slight trouble of adding to the bare name of objects in common use, just a word or two to single them out as his own property. Why not say, for instance, that the paper cutter was not used by him for cutting the leaves of books but to open letters, or add that the square bottle was a mucilage bottle? And how are we to explain the initial mistake concerning the existence of a library?

In addition to the incidents contained in these two passages, there are, among those declared "unknown," several without any weight and the following ones which I would rank as the best single incidents of the whole Report. In the fourth sitting, we read (p. 336) :

"Do you remember the little knife I used to pick out my nails with? (S. : "I am not sure, father.") "The little *brown handle* one. I had it in my vest pocket. You certainly must remember it."

Professor Hyslop had no knowledge of such a knife. He found on inquiry that his father did have a small brown-handled knife, but that he never carried it in his vest or coat pocket, but always in his trousers pocket. He used the knife for paring his nails and other ordinary purposes. Here we are told the size, the color, the use of the object and where carried. Everything is right excepting the last item. But brown-handle pocket knives are not rare and it is a common practice in people of the country and in others to use the pocket knife for paring the nails.

In the sixth sitting happened another interesting incident (p. 378) :

"I also recall the disturbance and trouble I had with one of *my eyes, the left one*. Do you not remember this, and the little so-called What P A yes, I hear. Pad. Pad. I had a peculiar mark, which you will recall, at the back of the ears [ear]?"

Here are Professor Hyslop's comments: "The allusion both to the difficulty with the left eye and to the *mark behind the ear* is, as far as I and my stepmother know, entirely false." Later on, when reading the sitting to his stepmother, she said, referring to the eye, "Well, I do not remember this, but it was true that he had some trouble with it. He used often to take off his spectacles and complain that there was something the matter with the left eye. He would rub it and complain that he could not see with it." And concerning the mark behind the ear, "she again said she did not know of it, but added spontaneously and without suggestion or further question, that her late husband had a mole on the left temple near the ear and in front of it." Why did the Communicator not get that mole in the right place! As to the eye, what man seventy-five years old has not had some little trouble with one or both of them? I recall my own father taking off his spectacles to rub his left eye,—at least, I think it was the left.

There is better than that however. In the sitting of May 30th, Vol. XIV—No. 1

the Communicator, trying to recall the name of some one who had had his foot injured, says (p. 428):

"Was it George? [Wrong so far as I know.—F. H. H.] I have been trying to think . . . think where is . . . and do you remember Peter who was . . . or belonged to Nanie?"

Professor Hyslop could attach no meaning to these names in this connection. In the sitting of June 1st the Communicator while trying to recall the name of a sister-in-law breaks out with the question (p. 452), "What is meant by Peter? Was it the dog George had? Can't you ask him?" Professor Hyslop inquired. The name Nanie seemed irrelevant. George declared he never had had a dog called Peter. But his mother remembered that, when he was between two and four years old, he had a little dog named Peter.

In the tenth sitting after the mention of George's name we have (p. 423):

"Yes, and do you remember *Thom* . . . Tom . . . and what has he done with him? I feel quite . . . yes . . . Yes, all right . . . I mean the horse?" (S.: "That's it. My conscience!")

"This reference to 'Tom, the horse,' writes Prof Hyslop, is profoundly interesting. As soon as I saw Tom written I thought of an old negro whom father often employed in the harvest field . . . But I was completely surprised when the statement came, 'I mean the horse.' Tom was the off-horse of a favorite pair of father's who had served him so well that he would never part with them" George Hyslop disposed of the horse when it died.

In the sixth sitting James McClellan who had a sister by the name of Mary Ann casually makes the remark, "My sister Ann is here with . . . yes" Professor Hyslop while at college had known her under the name of Mrs. Mary Mitchell. If she was known as Mary, why did the father say Ann?

These last three incidents, whether known or unknown to the sitter, are remarkable. If to them we add the connection of the name Harper Crawford with the church organ (pp. 491, 492), the mention of Hyomei and portions of the Cooper incident (chiefly or exclusively the reference to the Cooper School) and possibly the mention of one or two other names, we have the most evidence—like utterances of Mrs. Piper in these seances.

Unfortunately, the few more or less definite and exact utterances are swallowed up in pages of stuff for all the world identical with the deliverances of the professional medium. Why, if we

are dealing with spirit-communications, is there so much of the procedure and of the peculiar results of the trickster?⁵ Here is one of the supposedly strongly evidential group of incidents. I give it as a typical illustration of Mrs. Piper's method. Some one, Professor Hyslop's father we are told, asks the sitter concerning brother George. "Are you troubled about him . . . he is all right and will be James." For Professor Hyslop the Communicator's meaning is perfectly clear. His brother's neglect of business affairs put in his charge gave him frequent cause of complaint to their father. He answers, "Yes. All right." And when admonished not to worry says, "No: I will not worry," which implies that he has worried. Thereupon the clever, "But you do," and the sitter's explicit acknowledgment, "Yes, I have worried some, but I will not any more." Mrs. Piper is now certain that she has made a lucky hit and she is going to pursue her advantage. But how does she know that Professor Hyslop has a brother, George by name, still living? Had that triple information come out squarely, it would have been most remarkable. But she learned these three facts gradually in the first seance. Many names, relevant and irrelevant, had been mentioned. Then the *Sitter* asked, "Have you seen brother George?" (p. 307). No direct answer is given, but as an accordion is produced right after the query, she declares that it belonged to him. It was just the statement to risk. This time she happened to be wrong. A minute or two later she comes back to George, as indeed she ought to since it is, so far, one of the very few positive facts she has ascertained about Hyslop's relatives. She asks suddenly "Well, what did you mean by asking for George?" (p. 310) which being interpreted, means, "If that accordion you showed me when you inquired was not his, why did you inquire?" Then follows a dialogue settling what was yet uncertain, to-wit, whether George is still among the living.

"S.: I wanted to know if you remember George?"

"Yes, but George is here. I say George is not here."

"S.: Do you say George is *not* here?"

"I say no, he is not, and I could not understand why you asked me if he was here. Neither is he coming for a while yet. He is well and doing well and so be it."

⁵I do not intend to impeach Mrs. Piper's good faith. It may be all the work of the irresponsible secondary personalities.

Is this what one would expect on the Spiritistic hypothesis? On our hypothesis it is a little masterpiece. And now that these preliminary items of information have been obtained, she is going to make them fructify. In the second sitting she ventures the discreet query already quoted, evidently prompted by the sitter's inquiry. When she has discovered that he is worried (p. 317) she adds in the soothsayer's way, "Thank God. James, if you will only stick to this, you . . . stick . . . he [says?] stick to the promise not to worry, you will in time be contented and happy—while still in the body." Then she asks, "Can you not give me something belonging to him?" As the sitter is getting the accordion out of the parcel, the hand writes "He [Professor Hyslop's father] wants it so much, he used to play for you." The accordion did not belong to George, then most likely it belonged to the person with whom Professor Hyslop was endeavoring to establish communication, *i. e.*, his father. And this time her guess proved true.

In Dr. Hodgson's sittings (pp. 401, 402), several weeks later—there had been time for preparation—the Communicator abruptly says:

"I am trying to think of the principal of your school and what he said to me about George. I am still troubled about him, and if you can help me in any way to se . . . by sending me anything encouraging about him, I shall feel better I know."

S.: "Yes, I will write this, of course, to James."

"This, James, is the one thing I wish to right if possible, and perhaps you will be able to help me."

S.: "Yes, I am sure that James will do all that is best about George. Don't worry about him."

Then, after saying again that he has been much troubled about him and requesting the prayerful help of the sitter, comes:

"You see, I left with this on my mind, and I cannot dispose of it until I have learned from James that he will not feel troubled in this regard. We had our own thoughts and anxieties together regarding this . . . this . . . this as I [?] and Aunt Nannie also."

S.: "Do you mean she was anxious with you?" [Assent] "He says yes."

Is this not simply irritating if it comes from Professor Hyslop's father and perfectly in place if from Mrs. Piper trying to be wise on the little store of knowledge she has so far acquired? Why does she not tell us something definite as to the cause of this trouble?

In a later sitting with Professor Hyslop she comes back to George (p. 492).

"Tell me something more about George. He always did look out for number one."

* * * * *

"And about the fence [fense] I am thinking about the tax I left."

S.: "The tax has been paid . . . nearly all the debts have been cleared off . . ."

"Oh what a relief to my *mind*. I have thought and thought and thought what would Frank and George do if they had a hand in it."

With this the "George" incident comes to a close. I have already reported Professor Hyslop's comment on the first statement. He finds the reference to the Principal of their school "particularly pertinent" (pp. 404, 405), as the father had an important interview with him about the advisability of sending George to college. The last dialogue appears to him "as pertinent and extraordinary conversation as could be imagined. There is not an irrelevance in it. Every statement is charged with meaning that the members of the family know too well." Professor Hyslop's brother Frank is an invalid and one of the executors of the father's will. Both Frank and Aunt Nannie had appeared in preceding sittings. One cannot deny that the pertinence of one or two of the statements is striking, but when one observes carefully what is said and not what Professor Hyslop *adds*, the whole passage remains possibly within the limits of shrewd and lucky guessing. At any rate, it will not be denied that the method of the clever two-dollars medium could not be better imitated. Equivocations, hesitations, lack of definiteness and error mar every page, and almost every incident of these seventeen sittings.

Professor Hyslop has a double answer ready to meet the difficulties we have pointed out:—(a) The Communicators are not in a normal condition. Their state borders, at times at least, on delirium. There are indications of automatic activities, of loss of memory. (b) There may be mechanical difficulties in the way of the communication. The instrument (Mrs. Piper) may not respond perfectly to the desire of the would-be Communicator. Unfortunately for the upholders of Spiritism it is true that something like this first damning supposition seems absolutely necessary. The second is inefficient, as it does not explain why the instrument should be able to transmit names and not add the relationship, why it should be able to remember the square and the round bottle and

not say what was contained in them ; neither does it account for the fishing so often in evidence.

Instead of the preceding illustrations we might have chosen the messages concerning the disease of which Professor Hyslop's father died, or his conversation with his son on Swedenborg, or the fire and the railway accidents and the outcome would have been still less favorable to Spiritism.

With this our review of the evidence comes to an end. We have yet to state Professor Hyslop's main arguments in support of his conclusion. The Report is not sent forth, as many have conceived, as a demonstration of Spiritism. His intention was to "test hypotheses which profess to have some empirical evidence in their favor" (see footnote p. 4, pp. 244-247, 290-291) and his conclusion is that the choice—if choice there be—is between Spiritism on one hand and Universal Telepathy combined with Multiple Personality on the other. He prefers the former: "I give my adhesion to the theory that there is a future life and persistence of personal identity," but he adds, "I am willing to make it provisional upon the establishment . . . of sufficient telepathy, in combination with the other necessary processes, to account for the whole amazing result." (p. 290).

The main advantages he sees in the Spiritistic hypothesis are that it explains more readily and more satisfactorily (1) *the unity of consciousness* in the communications, (2) the dramatic play of personality.

By Unity of Consciousness is meant the fact that the Communicators, whenever they appear, are true to their own self as known to Professor Hyslop or to other persons. They give expression to their familiar ideas, use their accustomed phrases, evince the emotional tone that was theirs, etc. The dramatic play of personality is "that kind of action and change of content and characteristics . . . which occurs naturally in ordinary conversation between two or more persons." The weight of these two arguments depends, of course, entirely (a) upon the significance of the facts held to indicate Unity of Consciousness, (b) upon the possibility of a like result being produced otherwise than by Spiritism. The reader is already aware that in our opinion the great weakness of the Report is the failure to make a very large share to utterances neither Telepathic nor Spiritistic. It appears to us surpassingly clear that, even if there be a residuum

calling for these hypotheses, the bulk of the incidents are of more common origin.⁶ If Professor Hyslop denies that the appearance of Unity of Consciousness may be quite satisfactorily referred to Mrs. Piper's subliminal activity, it is because of what amounts in his eye to a *quasi* demonstration of superhuman knowledge. To his mind, the personages produced are not only consistent personalities, but they are reproductions of persons once living and never known to the medium. But if it be admitted that this knowledge may be entirely imaginary, the Multiple Personality hypothesis becomes sufficient. Without appealing to the rare and wonderful cases on record in the pathological Archives, our daily dreams afford sufficient evidence that the human mind is able to create personalities and make them act consistently in very complicated and long drawn out intercourse and, moreover, to mistake them for objective realities. The logical consistency and subtlety with which the sleeping mind will at times construct its fictitious personages is amazing. There is no Unity of Consciousness and no play of personality in Mrs. Piper's trance-utterances equal in complexity and perfection to what takes place in some continued dreams.

The chief arguments against Telepathy are, according to Professor Hyslop, (1) That it does not account for the selectiveness of the process, (2) that, to be sufficient, it has to be extended to all living consciousness and memory, (3) that the inconsistency of the mistakes are incongruent with the assumption of its easy access to all living memories, (4) that the Communicator's clearness and definiteness vary greatly while the data in the sitter's mind (Professor Hyslop's) are the same for all.

The first of these arguments is out of place—as Professor Hyslop, of course knows—as soon as the *selectiveness* is looked upon not as the result of Telepathy but of that unconscious mental activity of the subject himself which produces, for instance, the dream-personages. The second, third and fourth arguments fall to the ground unless it be shown that the facts necessitate the extension of Telepathy to all living consciousness and memory. I

⁶“The phrases said to have been habitual with the communicators (See pp. 89, 430 and Note 4 on p. 348) and other peculiarities in which the writer of the Report sees strong spiritistic evidence, are in my opinion, exactly on a par, as to their origin, with the other incidents we have passed in review. Space limitations prevent entering into the discussion of this portion of the evidence.

agree with Professor Hyslop in not being ready to accept, before we have further data, an hypothesis so stupendous as to involve "the power . . . to select any absolutely unknown person necessary, anywhere in the world, and from his memory make the selection of pertinent facts to represent personal identity . . ." (p. 139). But this hypothesis has not been shown to be unavoidable. On the contrary, the incidents which might seem to demand a universal Telepathy are so few and dubious, that it would be folly to embarrass ourselves with that bewildering supposition on a pretext as slender.

The five sittings held by Dr. Hodgson in the absence of Professor Hyslop, but in his behalf, repay scrutiny in a discussion of the wider Telepathy. They contain first and foremost false statements, and incidents too indefinite to have any weight. Beyond that there are the statements about Mr. Cooper (pp. 386 and 397)⁷ and the reference to a black morning coat (p. 387), (neither of which, in view of the large number of wrong incidents, goes beyond what chance might be expected to produce) and, finally, the trouble with the left eye and the mark behind the ear already taken into account.

The only possibilities that need be considered are, in my estimation:—

1. A combination of Secondary Personality and of Spirit-communication through the secondary personalities. This is the hypothesis for which Professor William James has declared a preference in his remarkable work on "Varieties of Religious Experience."⁸

2. A combination of Secondary Personality and of Telepathy. Not the amazing, universal, Telepathy which gives Professor Hyslop occasion for an easy triumph, but the narrower Telepathy limited to communications between the Sitter and the Medium.

3. Secondary Personality alone. On this last view the slight bits of apparently superhuman knowledge are to be ascribed to clever and lucky guessing, to suggestion from the sitters, or to

⁷The Cooper *School* is not mentioned in the writings at which Prof. Hyslop was present.

⁸Prof. James' "overbelief" is not exclusively, not even chiefly, determined by the class of facts dealt with in Prof. Hyslop's Report. It is the outcome of his understanding of the whole of human experience. In his view, if I understand him aright, the informing spirits need not be surviving human persons.

information surreptitiously secured from the outside world. This last supposition I admit to be extremely improbable. The share of suggestion cannot be correctly estimated by one not present at the sittings, neither by those present as sitters. Until further data are produced and as far as the Reports on Mrs. Piper are concerned one may rest in an easy indecision between the last two hypotheses. Mr. Frank Padmore, one of the very few men thoroughly well informed on this subject, does not think that even the narrow Telepathy is needed.⁹

Professor Hyslop's careful investigation may have at least one good result: the moderation of the disturbing wish of a certain class of people for a future life. They may learn to face the actual present more resolutely and wisely. For, although its purpose was not to discover the condition of the "departed," what comes through is sufficiently significant to make the heart of the believer sink. Three score and ten will appear long enough to everyone for that kind of life. However that may be, Professor Hyslop is certainly right in his contention that the condition of life in the other world cannot be made an argument against its possibility. For the rest, if the worse comes to the worse, humanity will have a unique chance of showing its stoutness of heart in facing this hopeless, repulsive, metempsychosis. And as to the Christian Religion, forswearing its stupendous mistake regarding the future life it would, let us hope, have grace enough to turn around and, instead of leading men to immortality, endeavor to deliver them from it, even as Buddhism does.

JAMES H. LEUBA.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

⁹See Chap. viii, Utterances of Mrs. Piper in his "*History of Modern Spiritualism*."